DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 109 JC 020 177

TITLE	Institutional Accountability Report, 2000.
INSTITUTION	Santa Fe Community Coll., Gainesville, FL. Office of Institutional Research and Planning.
PUB DATE	2001-01-01
NOTE	33p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; Community Colleges; Cost Effectiveness; *Educational Assessment; *Efficiency; Grade Point Average; Organizational Objectives; *Performance; Productivity; Remedial Programs; *School Effectiveness; School Holding Power; Transfer Rates (College); Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Santa Fe Community College FL

ABSTRACT

This document discusses Santa Fe Community College's (SFCC) (Florida) five accountability measures. The type of data available provided on these measures is as follows: (1) District High School Enrollment Report and Retention and Success Rate Report; (2) Associate of Arts Degree Transfer Performance in the State University System; (3) Licensure Passing Rate Report and Vocational Program Placement Report; (4) College Prep Retention and Success Rate Report; and (5) CLAST (College Level Academic Skills Test) Performance Report. Data for the measures are collected from the community college student database. Highlights of the measures for 1999 include: (1) SFCC ranked 11th in the state for grade point average (GPA) performance, with 74% of associate of arts (AA) students achieving a GPA of 2.5 and above; (2) systemwide, 73% of students achieved a GPA of 2.5 and above; (3) retention rate for AA students at SFCC was 62%, while the systemwide rate was 63%; (4) college prep success rate for reading at SFCC was 62%, while the rate for the system was 67%; and (5) college prep success rate for math at SFCC was 45%, while the system rate was 46%. (Contains 77 references.) (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made

ED 462 109

Institutional Accountability Report, 2000.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ❑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ❑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Grunder

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

JC 020 177

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of Santa Fe Community College's (SFCC's) *Institutional Accountability Report 2000* is to provide college planners and assessment specialists with the most recent set of accountability measures published by the Division of Community Colleges (DCC). Data for the annual state accountability measures are extracted from the 28 community colleges' Student Data Bases which are submitted to the DCC on a term-by-term basis.

The individual college and system-wide accountability data and goals presented in this report are based on five outcome measures. These measures and goals are used by the college as a benchmark for measuring SFCC's performance in attaining its goals in comparison to the other colleges within the Florida state system. The data contained within each of the performance standards are useful for college planning and assessment units as part of their institutional effectiveness processes. The first three accountability measures are also published in the Measures of Success section of Santa Fe Community College *Fact Book 2000-2001.*

Following this Executive Summary, the first section of the *Institutional Accountability Report 2000* the Summary of Accountability Measures Data Types defines and describes how each state accountability outcome measure looks at enrollment, retention, success, placement, licensure pass rates and academic success. Planners and researchers are encouraged to use these accountability performance data to assess programs, outcomes, and objectives.

The next section of the report presents the *Santa Fe Community College/System Wide Comparative Summary.* This summation of the state data defines each measure and reports on SFCC's performance over the past five years in relation to its individual college and to the system goals. These data indicate that SFCC has had good success in meeting most of its accountability goals.

The Historical Review of Accountability in Postsecondary Education provides the user with a research vignette that discusses and defines accountability in education and how it has evolved as the major assessment tool within the Florida community college system.

The Historical Review is followed by the October 2000 District Board of Trustees

accountability presentation in which district Board members were briefed on the college's accountability performance. Presented in a slide format, the presentation indicates that the college is doing exceptionally well in achieving its individual accountability goals and the community college system-wide goals.

During the past year, the college revised its strategic planning process resulting in the publication of *Strategic Plan 2000* which is presented in the next section entitled "Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness." This section describes how the SFCC College Planning Council has redirected its Institutional Effectiveness process incorporating college-level strategic planning with a five-step model for unit planning and assessment. The revised planning process, introduced in the *Santa Fe Community College Institutional Effectiveness Manual* (October 2000) is currently being used by college planning units as a guide for assessment and planning. This section is followed by a Glossary of terminology, from the DCC website and other sources, which are helpful in understanding and interpreting the information present in the reports.

A complete collection of the detailed state accountability data is provided in the appendix of this report. This report complete with appendix and other historical accountability data are available in the Institutional Research and Planning Library.

In conclusion, this report presents data documenting some of the many ways the college is held accountable for delivering educational services in innovative, effective, and caring ways. In addition, the accountability report affirms the success that the college presently enjoys in delivering these educational services while affirming the college's commitment to deliver these services even more successfully in the future.

Summary of Accountability Measures
Data Types

The Summary of Accountability Measures lists the types of data available in the Accountability Measures provided by the DCC. Published annually since 1994, the measures offer a rich source of historical information collected from the community college Student Data Base. The description of these measures are presented to familiarize the researcher, seeking current and longitudinal accountability trends, of the types of information available in the actual report which appears in following sections.

Accountability Measure 1 Part 1
District High School Enrollment Report

This measure presents, by college, the number and percentage of 1996-97 in-district public high school graduates who enrolled in the community college of their service district. Data are presented by degree seeking, non-degree seeking, and total within ethnicity. The ethnic categories presented are:

White non-Hispanic
Black non-Hispanic
Hispanic
Asian/Pacific Islander
American Indian or Alaskan Native
Other and
Total

Accountability Measure 1 Part 2
Retention and Success Rate Report

This measure tracks the status of Fall 1995, first-time-in-college (FTIC) A.A. and A.S. degree, and PSVC certificate seeking students. A.A. and A.S cohorts must have taken an entry level test and achieved at least 18 total hours during the tracking period of Fall 1995 through Winter/Spring 1998-99. The PSVC cohort must have taken an entry level test and achieved at least 9 total hours during the tracking period of Fall 1995 through Summer 1997-98. The data matrices present, by ethnicity within college, the number and percent of students' status by full-time/part-time and total status as listed below:

Students Graduating
Enrolled in Good Standing
Enrolled not in Good Standing
Left in Good Standing
Retention Rate and
Success Rate

Accountability Measure 2
A.A. Degree Transfer Performance in the SUS

This measure presents the performance of 1997-98 A.A. community college graduates, by college, within each of the state universities. The data matrices list community college students' GPA performance by the following categories:

Below 2.0,
between 2.0 and 2.5,
above 2.5,
above 3.0 and by
Mean GPA

The GPA data are presented for:

College Preparatory
Non-Preparatory
Preparatory and Non-Preparatory students combined
Ethnicity within University by Community College

Accountability Measure 3 Part 1
Licensure Passing Rate Report

This measure depicts the 1997-98 passing rates for vocational programs requiring licensure examinations. Data are presented for local programs and by system-wide program rates combined. The data list:

Program CIP Code
Program Title
Number of Students Tested
Number of Students Passed and
Percent of Test Takers Passing

The number tested, provided by the Bureau of Professional Regulations, are based on criteria which are not standard among the individual programs requiring testing. Therefore, individual colleges submit test results based on local level program data which more accurately reflect actual passing rates. SFCC supplemental data are reflected in the Comparative Summary Chart. SFCC's individual program results in the detail reports are included in a separate chart submitted to the DCC.

Accountability Measure 3 Part 2
Vocational Program Placement Report

This measure lists individual vocational program placement rates (the percent of students employed in their field of training) for SFCC and for individual programs system-wide. The data are presented for 1996-97students identified in the Student Data Base as program completers or program leavers and located through the FETPIP follow-up process. Results are shown by:

CIP Code,
Program Title,
Number in Placement Pool,*
Number Placed and
Percent Placed.**

* The Placement Pool is comprised only of students located by FETPIP.

** The placement data supplied FETPIP reflects only those completers and leavers that were found to be employed in their field of training. The DCC definition for placement includes students continuing their education and in the military. Therefore, colleges are allowed to submit local level supplemental placements which reflect students continuing their education and in the military. SFCC's supplemental program placement results (which are found in the detail reports) are listed on a separate chart submitted to the DCC.

Accountability Measure 4 Part 1
College Prep Retention & Success Rate Report

This measure indicates the pass rates for Fall term 1996-97 degree seeking FTIC students needing remediation in reading, writing and/or math to perform college level course work. The data presented by ethnicity within the community college are:

Number of FTIC Degree Seeking Students Taking an Entry Level Test (ELT),
Number and Percent who Failed the ELT,
Number ELT Takers who Failed by Type (Reading/Writing/Math).

Further detail of the data presents pass rates for Reading, Writing and Math. The detail lists:

Number taking the ELT,
Number passing the highest level ELT, and
Percent passing the highest level ELT.

System wide pass rates are presented for each ethnic category.

Accountability Measure 4 Part 2
College Prep Retention & Success Rate Report

This measure tracks the retention and success rates of Fall 1995, first-time-in-college (FTIC) A.A. and A.S. degree, and PSVC certificate seeking students. A.A. and A.S cohorts must have taken an entry level test and achieved at least 18 total hours during the tracking period of Fall 1995 through Winter/Spring 1998-99. The PSVC cohort must have taken an entry level test and achieved at least 9 total hours during the tracking period of Fall 1995 through Summer 1997-98. The data matrices present, by ethnicity within college and systemwide, the number and percent of students by Full-Time/Part-Time and total status as listed below:

Students Graduating
Enrolled in Good Standing
Enrolled not in Good Standing
Left in Good Standing
Retention Rate and
Success Rate

Retention is defined as the sum of the number of cohort students who either graduated, are enrolled in good standing, or enrolled not in good standing, divided by the total cohort.

Success is defined as the sum of the number of cohort students who graduated, enrolled in good standing, or left in good standing, divided by the total cohort.

Accountability Measure 5 - CLAST Performance Report

The measure presents the number and percent of students who attempted and passed the Essay, Math, Reading, and Language subsets, or all subsets combined, of the CLAST Examination. The cohort is comprised of students from 1997-98, with 60 or more credits at a particular community college (excluding College Prep courses). The data matrices are presented by:

Ethnicity within the Community College and Systemwide
Prep Students, Non-Prep Students and Total Students who Attempted and Passed each or all subsets of the CLAST Examination

Institutionally determined alternatives to CLAST are also counted as a "pass."

Santa Fe Community College/System Wide
Comparative Summary
1999 Accountability Update

Measure (M) and Part (P)*		All figures are in percentages.									
		SFCC 1994	SFC C 1995	SFC C 1996	SFCC 1997	SFCC 1998	SFCC 1999	SYS 1999	SFCC Ranking 1999	SFCC Current Goal***	SYS Goal 2003
MIP1	Dist. High School Enrl	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.81	28.10	1	N/A	N/A
M1P2	Retention Rate A.A.	56.29	59.38	65.71	62.48	61.93	62.43	62.84	11	57	70
	Success Rate A.A.	83.96	82.79	82.05	82.10	77.27	78.36	81.0	23	85	80
	Retention Rate A.S.	64.49	52.83	59.79	69.01	75.70	70.21	57.36	5	65.5	70
	Success Rate A.S.	86.23	83.02	93.81	98.59	99.07	100.0	78.82	1	87	80
	Retention Rate P.S.V.C.	69.57	90.00	76.92	72.73	100.00	75.0	86.71	20	80	70
	Success Rate P.S.V.C.	86.96	70.00	84.62	72.73	88.89	75.0	83.22	19	88	80
M2	GPA Performance A.A. 2.5 & Above	74.20	70.04	77.97	67.33	74.88	74.72	72.63	11	76	70
M3P1	State Licensure Pass Rate **	89.50	91.30	85.80	93.90	98.10	98.1**	86.4	N/A	90.1	90
M3P2	Vocational Program Placement **	87.23	89.63	88.60	89.70	90.60	93.1**	74.1	N/A	90	90
M4P1	College Prep Success Rate - Reading	70.46	69.93	66.56	57.39	54.72	62.29	66.89	21	72	65
	College Prep Success Rate - Writing	61.59	58.52	51.82	50.16	55.13	51.42	62.70	22	65	68
	College Prep Success Rate - Math	43.15	34.46	30.69	36.38	40.38	45.25	45.81	13	46	50
M4P2	College Prep Retention Rate A.A.	54.97	60.87	60.90	57.72	57.14	35.85	28.17	6	63.5	70
	College Prep Success Rate A.A.	81.46	76.09	78.21	81.88	75.97	81.13	81.5	21	84	75
M5	CLAST Performance College Prep	65.70	65.84	63.27	63.85	60.50	75.87	77.3	19	68	68
	CLAST Performance Non-College Prep	89.13	88.85	89.35	85.65	84.12	93.27	92.33	21	92	90
	CLAST Total Performance	77.81	78.18	78.05	76.34	73.33	85.29	84.16	19	80	80

*Definitions and System Goals for 2003 are attached.

**Figures represent data from the institution, NOT from the student data base system.

*** SFCC long-range goal for each measure

Source: Data from Accountability Data Reports & Forms, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997 & 1998

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Measures of Accountability Definitions and SFCC Goals

Measure 1 Part 1 **Enrollment**

Definition: The retention measure reflects the number and percentage of Florida public high school graduates who enrolled in the community college in their respective district.

Retention Goal: While Santa Fe does not currently have a goal in this particular measure, the high percentage of students who enroll and the #1 ranking of Santa Fe relative to other Florida community colleges indicates our success in serving high school graduates in our district of Alachua and Bradford counties.

Measure 1 Part 2 **Retention Rate A.A.**

Definition: The retention measure reflects the number of associate of arts degree students, who have earned 18 credit hours, that were retained or graduated four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Retention Goal: By 2003, to retain or graduate at least 70% of the associate of arts degree students four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Success Rate A.A.

Definition: Similar to the retention measure, the success measure indicates how many associate of arts students, who have earned at least 18 credit hours, have graduated, were retained in good standing, or left in good standing four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Success Goal: By 2003, to graduate, retain in good standing or have left in good standing at least 80% of the associate of arts degree students four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Retention Rate A.S.

Definition: The retention measure assesses the number of associate of science degree students, who have earned at least 18 credit hours, that were retained or graduated four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Retention Goal: By 2003, to retain or graduate at least 70% of the associate of science degree students four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Success Rate A.S.

Definition: The success measure assesses how many associate of science degree students, who have earned at least 18 credit hours, have graduated, were retained in good standing, or left in good standing four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Success Goal: By 2003, to graduate, retain in good standing or have left in good standing at least 80% of the associate of science degree students four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Retention Rate P.S.V.C.

Definition: The retention measure assesses the number of P.S.V.C. students who were retained or graduated four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Retention Goal: By 2003, to retain or graduate at least 70% of the P.S.V.C. students four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Success Rate P.S.V.C.

Definition: The success measure assesses how many P.S.V.C. students have graduated, were retained in good standing, or left in good standing four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Success Goal: By 2003, to graduate, retain in good standing or have left in good standing at least 80% of the P.S.V.C. students four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Measure 2 **GPA Performance A.A. 2.5 & Above**

Definition: This measure shows the percentage of students who are below 2.0 GPA, at or above 2.0, at or above 2.5, and at or above 3.0. The performance measure addresses students with a 2.5 and above GPA.

Goal: By 2003, to have at least 70% of the associate of arts graduates who have transferred to a state university perform at or above 2.5 grade point average.

Measure 3 Part 1 **State Licensure Pass Rate**

Definition: The licensure pass rate measure shows the number of students tested, the number of students passed, and the percentage of students who passed the licensure exam for respective vocational programs. The performance measure presented is for all vocational licensure programs combined.

Goal: By 2003, to have at least 90% of all students who take licensure exams pass.

Measure 3 Part 2 **Vocational Program Placement**

Definition: This measure shows the number and percentage of students who completed a program, were found in the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) pool of employed, and were placed in an occupation related to their instruction. The performance measure is a total of all vocational program completers combined who were placed in field.

Goal: By 2003, at least 90% of all students who complete a community college program will be successfully placed.

Measure 4 Part 1 **College Prep Success Rate - Reading**
College Prep Success Rate - Writing
College Prep Success Rate - Math

Definition: The college preparatory measure shows the number and percentage of FTIC students who tested into and enrolled in college preparatory courses who have successfully completed the program within two years. Accountability goals are set for each of the three college preparatory areas--reading, writing and math.

Goal: (Reading): By 2003, to have at least 65% of the students who test into college preparatory reading successfully complete the program within two years.
(Writing): By 2003, to have at least 68% of the students who test into college preparatory writing successfully complete the program within two years.
(Math): By 2003, to have at least 50% of the students who test into college preparatory math successfully complete the program within two years.

Measure 4 Part 2 **College Prep Retention Rate A.A.**

Definition: The college preparation retention measure indicates the number and percentage of students who successfully completed a college preparatory program and have subsequently graduated or who are still enrolled in an associate of arts degree program four years after the date of initial enrollment in the A.A. Degree Program.

Goal: By 2003, to retain or graduate at least 70% of the students four years after initial enrollment in the associate of arts degree program.

College Prep Success Rate A.A.

Definition: The success measure shows the number and percentage of college preparatory students who successfully completed a college preparatory program and have subsequently graduated or who are retained in good standing or who have left in good standing four years after the date of initial enrollment in the A.A. Degree Program.

Goal: By 2003, to graduate, retain in good standing or have left in good standing at least 75% of the associate of arts degree students, who successfully completed a college preparatory program, four years after the date of initial enrollment.

Measure 5 **CLAST Performance College Prep**
CLAST Performance Non-College Prep
CLAST Total Performance

Definition: The CLAST measure shows the number and percentage of students who have completed 60 or more college credits at a specific institution who have met the CLAST passing standards.

Goal: (CLAST Performance College Prep): By 2003, to have at least 68% of students who completed a college preparatory program and subsequently went on to complete 60 credit hours meet the CLAST standards.
(CLAST Performance Non-College Prep): By 2003, to have at least 90% of the students who were not in a college preparatory program and who have completed 60 credit hours meet the CLAST standards.
(CLAST Total Performance): By 2003, to have a total (College Prep and Non-College Prep) of at least 80% who have completed 60 credit hours meet the CLAST standards.

Historical Review of Accountability in Postsecondary Education

"Accountability is a means of judging the effects of policies and programs against a set of desired expectations or agreed upon results." (Florida Auditor General, 1993). The purpose of accountability is to provide information that allows observers and stakeholders to decide if progress is being made toward goals and priorities. Accountability may be viewed as externally focused as it provides information that responds to state government, regulatory, or licensing agencies. Assessment is internally focused, producing information or data colleges use to evaluate priorities and procedures. Assessment may be used to respond to demands for accountability (Van de Water, 1994).

In the 1970's, accountability for higher education emerged as part of a larger accountability movement directed toward all kinds of public service organizations (Bowen, 1974). The impetus for the need to hold institutions of higher education accountable was an erosion of confidence in the institutions' ability to produce a relevant, quality product. A Nation at Risk, a 1983 report by the U.S. Department of Education, investigated deficiencies and led the way for other reports critical of our education system (Parnell, 1990). There was a need to be able to assess the results of education and compare those results with costs. Accountability was the banner and the means for holding colleges and universities responsible (Astin, 1991; Campbell, 1986; Elmore, Abelmann, Fuhrman, 1996), compelling them to show that the outcomes they produced were worth the cost. The implication was that "institutional efforts should be directed toward appropriate goals and that the outcomes should be consistent with these goals and should be achieved at minimum cost." (Bowen, 1974). In this way, stakeholders including the public may better appreciate the performance of the institution. In

his writing about evaluation of accountability in higher education institutions, Bowen (1974) saw the steps to attaining accountability as (1) defining goals in ordered priority, (2) identifying and measuring outcomes, (3) comparing goals and outcomes to determine the degree to which the goals have been achieved, and (4) measuring the cost. In the 70's and 80's assessment efforts were decentralized and institution based. Later, Elmore, Abelmann, and Fuhrman (1996) recognized what they named a model of "new educational accountability." This model has three parts: "(1) a primary emphasis on student performance as the basis for accountability, sometimes accompanied by other indicators of success; (2) the creation of relatively complex systems of standards by which data on student performance are compared....; and (3) the creation of systems of rewards and penalties and intervention strategies to introduce incentives for improvement." The focus these authors saw with this new model was more on results as evidenced by learning for students than on compliance with rules. (Elmore, et al, 1996; Nichols, 1997).

Accountability in the 90's brought state government concerns into the picture in a more active and prescriptive way. Public accountability as it related to students, employers, parents, and the general public was defined with a set of performance indicators aimed at telling the public what had been achieved with their resources (Rupert, 1994). Community colleges have been criticized for "their lukewarm responses to calls for greater accountability and improved institutional effectiveness measures" (Roueche, 1997). The criticism coincided with increased competition for public resources for colleges and universities in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Honeyman, 1996). And so, there was a need on the part of institutions of higher education and community colleges in particular to regain public trust in what higher education does by

being able to define and demonstrate quality, particularly in terms of student learning outcomes (Leslie, 1996; Strategic Plan for Graduate Education, 1997).

A report by the Education Commission of the States saw Florida as one of ten states leading the development of new accountability policies and procedures (Rupert, 1994). In Florida, the legislature has determined the level and definition of accountability for its institutions of higher education thereby following a perceived national proliferation of activity to create accountability in higher education institutions (Florida Statute 240.324; Van de Water, 1994; Day, 1994).

Accountability in Florida Community Colleges

Accountability for higher education in Florida originated with and emanates from the Florida Legislature (Van de Water, 1994). In 1979 a select group of Florida community colleges participated in the implementation of the state Accountability Standards and Evaluation Process that had been published by the State Department of Education. The purpose of this process was to study the colleges and so "...provide a framework for communication between the community colleges and the State Board of Education, and through the State Board to other bodies which have responsibility for community college education." (Florida Statute 230.755). Under Florida Statute 230.755, the State Board of Education was required to prescribe minimum standards for community colleges with regard to their organization, acquisition, or operation as public community colleges. Local community college boards of trustees were directed to use the standards as a basis for accountability as part of the responsibility vested in them. (SFCC Board of Trustees, 1980). In 1979, there were seven accountability standards prescribed by the State Board of Education for local boards of trustees to evaluate:

1. Needs Assessment
2. Student Goals
3. Personnel Decisions
4. Equal Opportunity
5. Program Plan
6. Program Evaluation
7. Differentiated Responsibilities

The 1982 Florida Legislature created a state coordinating board for the community college system as a part of the Department of Education. In 1983, the Florida State Board of Education introduced an accountability system for all levels of public education, including community colleges. Indicators of Educational Excellence were set up to establish annual goals for the purpose of achieving standards of excellence. The duties of the State Community College Coordinating Board were found in Florida Statute 82-240.305 and the powers of this Board were increased in Florida Statute 84-240.311, the Omnibus Education Act of 1984 (Campbell, 1986). The State Community College Coordinating Board was renamed the State Board of Community Colleges in 1984 with monitoring accountability in the community colleges one of its primary tasks. The State Board of Education required the State Board of Community Colleges to report annually on system progress toward meeting annual goals (Burt, 1993). Campbell (1986) observed that legislation produced incremental changes in governance that was gradually shifting power over the community colleges from local boards to the legislature through "legislative involvement and demands for educational accountability..."

With an eye toward measuring student outcomes, the College Level Academic Skills Project in 1981 designed and developed a sophomore-level testing program, which resulted in the College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST). CLAST has been administered to all college sophomores in Florida seeking entry into upper division college as "rising juniors" since 1983 (Van de Water, 1994). The test assessed reading, writing, and math skills; the principle output indicators for general education. Community college system accountability indicators were revised in 1988 to include CLAST and these indicators comprised the following:

- CLAST Scores
- Findings of Follow-Up Studies of Graduates
- Licensure Examinations of Graduates
- Community Economic Development reflected in enrollments in vocational education programs as a percent of district population over 18 years of age.
- Quality of Life, quantified by enrollments in college prep, adult basic and secondary, lifelong learning and recreation and leisure as a percent of district population over 18 years of age (Burt, 1993).

During the 1991 legislative session, the Florida state legislature continued its pursuit of accountability in a more directive way, passing the "Community College Accountability Process Act" (Florida Statute 240.324, 1991). In this statute, state legislators decreed that "the State Board of Community Colleges and the community college boards of trustees shall develop and implement a plan to improve and evaluate the instructional and administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the State Community College System" (Tyree, 1995). To accomplish this a state implementation committee identified five new measures of

accountability in 1992 to address the legislature's chief issues of concern (Hellmich, 1993). Current data supporting these outcome measures are published annually by the State Board of Community Colleges and are the basis for the state accountability plan which the legislation also stipulated would be used to evaluate the performance of the president of each of the 28 Florida community colleges. The State Board of Community Colleges was required by the 1991 statute to report annually on the achievement of the educational accountability measures with full implementation of this new accountability process by December, 1994 (Burt, 1993).

The 1994 Accountability Plan for Florida was the first instrument of compliance with the 1991 accountability legislation and it established goals and processes in a way that provides for the "systematic, ongoing improvement and assessment of the quality and efficiency of the State Community College System" (Florida Statute 240.324, 1991). And so the data associated with these measures has been available to the colleges for use in their own planning and accountability processes.

The Florida Community College System Accountability Reports, (which are published in this report), were first published beginning in 1994 as compilations of accountability performance measures based on data submitted by each of the community colleges. Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) review of 1996 concluded that, "To the extent that existing accountability measures are reflected in either performance-based program budgeting, or incentive funding procedures or are used for some other institutional purpose, they should continue to be required on a statewide basis." (FCCS Accountability Report, 1996).

The 1996 PEPC report also concluded that the state accountability measures had been incorporated as part of college institutional effectiveness planning processes at each of the 28

Florida community colleges and the colleges were using them as assessment tools (FCCS, 1996).

Santa Fe Community College makes the data associated with the state accountability measures available to its Institutional Effectiveness planning/assessment units annually. This edition of *Santa Fe Community College Institutional Achievement, 2000 Accountability Report* is one vehicle for presenting the data. The data is also presented annually in the October accountability presentation for the Santa Fe Board of Trustees. The reports and accountability data are available in the Institutional Research and Planning Library.

Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness

"Statewide planning for the community college system is the domain of the Florida State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC). Institutional planning is the responsibility of each community college within the system." (Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee, 1994; Florida Statute 240.324, 1999).

Recognizing the need for consistency between statewide and institutional planning, the SBCC recommended in the 1993 Community College Statewide Master Plan, that a method be determined to link these planning processes by means of an Institutional Accountability Planning and Reporting Process. In 1994, the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee of the Committee on Accountability and Effectiveness published a guide, which laid out specific statewide accountability planning procedures for the colleges to ensure consistency and completeness. The SBCC presented this system-wide accountability plan to the governor and the legislature that was based on the college accountability plans and also reflected a degree of self-accountability or independence for the colleges. This process of using college accountability plans and Student Data Base data to generate a system-wide accountability plan lasted for three years (1994-1996). The last required college accountability plan was submitted to the State Board in 1996. However, the colleges have continued to use the data, to varying degrees, for their individual Institutional Effectiveness planning and assessment.

Institutional effectiveness is the systematic approach to assess how well and to what extent the Institution performs its mission and achieves its goals. Institutional effectiveness planning is based on learning outcomes or performance accountabilites. SACS Criteria state that institutional effectiveness is a very important element for accreditation, but does not prescribe a single conceptual interpretation of Institutional Effectiveness. SACS does make it clear that Institutional Effectiveness should be expressed as a broad-based system, appropriate to the purpose and context of the college. The purpose of Santa Fe Community College is expressed well in the *Santa Fe Community College Strategic Plan 2000* which is presented at the end of this report section.

SACS Criteria Section 3.1 covers planning and evaluation for instructional programs. It states that colleges are to evaluate the extent to which educational goals are being achieved and use the results of these evaluations to improve educational programs, services and operations. SACS Criteria Section 3.2 covers planning and evaluation for administrative and educational support services. It states that for each administrative and educational support service unit, the college must develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which unit goals are achieved; and use the results to improve services.

To ensure Santa Fe Community College is in compliance with SACS Institutional Effectiveness requirements and to provide a framework for program quality improvement, the College Planning Council (CPC) was formed and appointed by President Tyree in January 2000. The College Planning Council is charged with the responsibility for developing and maintaining the college institutional effectiveness process. The Council's main product in 2000 was *Strategic Plan 2000*. To demonstrate institutional effectiveness in an accountable way, SFCC's institutional effectiveness process blends strategic planning at the college level with unit level planning and assessment. On the college level, strategic planning develops the college's Mission Statement and Goals, which are reviewed on a five-year cycle. The Strategic Initiatives for the College Goals are defined and evaluated annually. On the unit level (the heart of the institutional effectiveness process), annual planning, assessment, and use of assessment results are conducted to improve education outcomes and support services for education. The annual cycle for the unit institutional effectiveness process is a five-step process described in the *Santa Fe Institutional Effectiveness Manual*. This annual unit process includes an annual college assessment report that includes feeder reports from each of the college's institutional effectiveness units.

Strategic Plan 2000

Mission Statement

MISSION/VISION

Adding value to the lives of our students and enriching our community

VALUES

Santa Fe Community College is a dynamic, innovative learning community committed to

- Academic excellence, academic freedom, and intellectual pursuit
- Individual and social responsibility
- Honesty, integrity, and civility
- Cultural diversity and equity
- Collaboration with our community
- Open access
- Life long learning
- Assessment, accountability, and improvement

GOALS

- **Outreach and Access**

Identify, assess, and meet community needs to promote open access to the college.

- **Delivery Alternatives**

Assess student needs and outcomes and create innovative and flexible learning opportunities.

- **Educational Programs**

Provide learning opportunities and academic support to ensure the highest levels of academic performance.

- **Workforce Development**

Provide student-centered workforce programs in collaboration with local employers and economic development agencies.

- **Human Resources**

Recruit, develop, assess, and retain quality full and part-time faculty and staff.

- **Technology**

Provide information technology systems and infrastructure to support the college's mission.

- **Resources**

Develop, obtain, and allocate the necessary resources to implement the college's mission.

Clustered with each of these goals are associated Initiatives, which have been derived from issues by the College Planning Council at the March 2000 retreat and refined at later meetings. These Initiatives will be defined in more detail in Fall 2000 to include cost and implementation features. This part of the Strategic Plan will be reviewed every 5 years.

santa fe community college

Goals & Initiatives

OUTREACH & ACCESS

Identify, assess, and meet community needs to promote open access to the college.

- Serving communities in Alachua and Bradford counties.
- Aligning educational offerings with area high schools.
- Maintaining access for all students.
- Playing a significant role in social services in light of welfare reform and the trend toward privatization.
- Assessing college programs in the light of local community needs.
- Promoting awareness of the college globally.
- Providing support services to ensure student success.

DELIVERY ALTERNATIVES

Assess student needs and outcomes and create innovative and flexible learning opportunities.

- Rethinking teaching and learning processes in the light of information technology.
- Partnering with other community colleges in the State for mutual benefit.
- Increasing learning options that are consistent with quality education.
- Scheduling to meet the needs and preferences of students.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Provide learning opportunities and academic support to ensure the highest levels of academic performance.

- Reconsidering the general education core for the learning needs of the 21st Century student.
- Improving performance and results in all program areas including student retention and completion.
- Assessing educational programs to encourage academic excellence.
- Improving the graduation rates for all program areas.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Provide student-centered workforce programs in collaboration with local employers and economic development agencies.

- Assessing AS/workforce programs in the light of local economic needs to determine which programs to build up and which to de-emphasize.
- Addressing the decline in health care enrollments.
- Exploring creative partnerships with local business and industry for mutual benefit.
- Adapting to professional regulatory changes.
- Playing a significant role in job creation, development and placement in Alachua and Bradford counties.
- Increasing service to business and industry through non-credit programs.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Recruit, develop, assess, and retain quality full and part-time faculty and staff.

- Offering mind/body wellness programs for students, faculty and staff.
- Ensuring the recruitment of top-notch faculty and staff as current faculty and staff retire.
- Growing college leaders through a comprehensive leadership development program.
- Determining and implementing a target mix of part-time and full-time faculty by department.
- Providing continuous training and development for faculty and staff development to take full advantage of information technology and other professional development opportunities.
- Improve working conditions, pay and professional development for part-time faculty.

TECHNOLOGY

Provide information technology systems and infrastructure to support the college's mission.

- Providing on-line access to student services such as self-registration and fee payment.
- Rethinking college processes in the light of emerging information technology.
- Providing information technology systems and network infrastructure sufficient to support the college's mission.
- Determining what the college should do in relation to the Internet.
- Providing access to information for planning and assessment.

RESOURCES

Develop, obtain, and allocate the necessary resources to implement the college's mission.

- Securing legislative support and funding for the college's mission and vision.
- Raising private funds to support the college's mission and vision.
- Providing facilities that keep pace with changes in programs and technology.
- Assessing potential grants for financial viability and alignment with the college's mission and vision.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Glossary

Accountability – Liability for something of value either contractually or because of one's position of responsibility.

Accreditation – Certification by an official review board that specific requirements have been met, such as institutional accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Articulation – The bringing together of the various parts of the educational system to facilitate the smooth transition of students through the system.

Board of Trustees – The corporate body of persons appointed by the governor as the local governing board for a community college.

College Preparatory – Preparatory instruction for students to enroll in college credit instruction.

District – The geographical area served by a community college, which ranges from one to six counties.

Dual Enrollment – Enrollment in two institutions at the same time, such as a college and a high school or two colleges.

First Time in College – A student attending a college for the first time with no credit toward a degree or formal award from any other institution who is enrolled in a course in an instructional area that leads to a degree or certificate.

General Education – Basic liberal education in communications, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

Lower Division – College freshman and sophomore level.

Native Student – A student who started as a freshman and remained in the same institution, as opposed to a transfer student.

Placement and Follow-Up – The system for tracking vocational program graduates to determine their placement (employment) and job performance in order to evaluate the job preparatory programs from which they graduated.

Placement Rate – The percentage of job preparatory program graduates who find jobs that use the skills acquired in the job preparatory programs, who enter the military, or who continue postsecondary education.

Preparatory Instruction – Instruction to remedy deficiencies in knowledge and skills necessary upon entry into a degree or certificate program.

Program Review – The periodic review of community college instructional programs. One level is the annual review of program-specific data by the individual colleges and the State Board of Community Colleges. A second level is a more extensive review by the individual colleges. A third level is a statewide review by the State Board of Community Colleges based on statewide issues.

Transfer Student – A student who attended one or more colleges as a regular student in addition to the one in which currently enrolled, as opposed to a native student.

Vocational Certificate – The award for satisfactory completion of a job preparatory program of noncollege-level courses.

REFERENCES

Affholter, D.P. (1994). Outcome monitoring. In J.S. Wholey, H.P. Hatry, & K.E. Newcomer(eds.) Handbook of practical program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ansoff, H.I. (1979). The changing shape of the strategic problem. In D.E. Schendel & C.W. Hofer (Eds.), Strategic management: A new view of business policy and planning. Boston: Little, Brown, & Company.

Astin, A.W. (1991). Achieving educational excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baker, G.A., Dudziak, J. & Tyler, P. (Eds.). (1994). A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission and management. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Below, P.J., Morrisey, G.L., & Acomb, B.L. (1987). The executive guide to strategic planning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennett, W. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Board of Trustees, Santa Fe Community College. (1980, March 20). Santa Fe Community College accountability standards evaluation. Gainesville, FL: Santa Fe Community College.

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1997). Reframing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, H.R. (1974, Spring). Evaluating institutions for accountability. New directions for institutional research 1, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryson, J.M. & Alston, F.K. (1996). Creating & implementing your own strategic plan. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bryson, J.M. (1995). Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations (Rev. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Burke, J.C. (2000). Arguments about performance funding rhetoric and reality. Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute of Government.

Burt, C.L. (1993). Management reform and accountability in higher education; Volume 1: The community colleges. Tallahassee, FL: Committee on Higher Education, Florida House of Representatives.

Carlson, R.V., & Awkerman, G. (Eds.). (1991). Educational planning: Concepts, strategies, and practices. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.

Carmen, B. (2000, 15 June). Memorandum for community college reports coordinators: Final closeout PBIF earnings report for 1998-1999. Tallahassee, Fl: Department of Education.

Caudle, S.L. (1994). Using qualitative approaches. In J.S. Wholey, H.P. Hatry, & K.E. Newcomer(eds.) Handbook of practical program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chaffee, E.E. & Sherr, L.A. (1992). Quality: Transforming postsecondary education. Report No. 3 Washington D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Clark, P.A., Gonzales, L., Vivian, W. (1998). New tools for adult, literacy, and community education. Gainesville, FL: Center for Community Education, University of Florida.

Clark, P.A., Gonzales, L., Giddis, R. (1997). New FRAMES for adult, literacy, and community education. Gainesville, FL: Center for Community Education, University of Florida.

Coleman, M.S. Implementing the strategic plan: A second year report on meeting targets. (December 1997). The University of Iowa. Iowa City, IA: University Relations Publications.

Committee on Accountability and Effectiveness. (1996). Florida community college system 1996 accountability report. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Community College System.

Committee on Higher Education, Florida House of Representatives. (1992). Management reform and accountability in higher education. (Vol. 1: the community colleges). Tallahassee, FL: Author.

Community college accountability process. Title XVI, Florida Statutes 240.324 (1999).

Community colleges; definition, mission, and responsibilities.Title XVI, Florida Statutes 240.301 (1999).

Cope, R.G. (1987). Opportunity from strength: Strategic planning clarified with case examples. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education report No. 8. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Cope, R.G. Strategic policy planning: A guide for college and university administrators. Littleton, CO: The Ireland Educational Corporation.

Cross, P.C. (1982, December). Thirty years have passed: Trends in general education. In B.L. Johnson (Ed.) New Directions for Community Colleges: General Education in Two Year Colleges 10, (4), 11-20.

DMS: Performance Accountability System. [On-line]. Available:

http://fcn.state.fl.us/oraweb/owa/pas_display.homepage.htm

Day, P.R. (1994). Institutional accountability planning and reporting process guide. Talahassee, FL: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee, Committee on Accountability and Effectiveness, Florida State Board of Community Colleges.

Dillon, J.T. (1984, Fall). The classification of research questions. Review of Educational Research, 54, 327-361.

Division of Community Colleges, Department of Education, State of Florida. (1998). Agency strategic and accountability plan Florida community college system. Tallahassee, FL: Author.

Dooris, M.J. & Lozier, G.G. Adapting formal planning approaches: The Pennsylvania State University. In F.A. Schmidtlein & T.H. Milton (Eds.) (1990, Fall). New Directions for Institutional Research: Adapting Strategic Planning to Campus Realities, 67, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dozier, J., Howard, S., Jenkins, R., Williams, M.J. (1988). Operational planning and budgeting for colleges. (2nd ed.) Washington, D.C. National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Elmore, R.F., Abelson, C.H., and Fuhrman, S.H. (1996). The new accountability in state education reform: From process to performance. In Holding schools accountable. (pp.65-98). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Ewell, P.T. (1990). Assessment and the "new accountability": A challenge for higher education's leadership. (No. PA-90-3). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States Distribution Center.

Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. (1993). Accountability in Florida's postsecondary education system. (Report 2). Tallahassee, FL: Author.

Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. (1998). Challenges and choices: The master plan for Florida postsecondary education. Tallahassee, FL: Author.

Freeman, J.D. (1977). Comprehensive planning in higher education. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Company.

Glass, J. C. & Jackson, K.L. (1998). Integrating resource development and institutional planning. In Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 22, 715-739.

Goodstein, L.D., Nolan, T.M., & Pfeiffer, J.W. (1993). Applied strategic planning: A comprehensive guide. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grunder, P., Judd, R.B. & Wingo, O. (1991). Developing an institutional effectiveness assessment program. Gainesville, FL: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida.

Grunder, P. & Yonutas, D.N. (1990). Measuring institutional effectiveness through the strategic planning process. Gainesville: Santa Fe Community College.

Hellmich, D. & Bell, M. (1993). Florida Community College System's Accountability Plan (Institutional Research Notes, 3 (2)). Gainesville, FL: Santa Fe Community College.

Honeyman, D.S., Wattenbarger, J.L., & Westbrook, K.C. (Eds.). (1996). A struggle to survive; Funding higher education in the next century. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Houston, R.W., Faseler, L., White, S.C., Sanders, P., Senter, J, Butts, W. (1978). Assessing school/college/community needs. Omaha, NB: Center for Urban Education.

Keller, G. (1983). Academic strategy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kotler, P. & Murphy, P.E. (1981). Strategic planning for higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 52, 470-489.

Ladd, H.F. (Ed.). (1996). Holding schools accountable - Performance-based reform in education. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Leslie, D.W. & Fretwell, E.K., Jr. (1996). Wise moves in hard times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Market-driven, performance-based incentive funding for vocational and technical education programs. Title XVI, Florida Statutes 239.249 (1999).

Massey, E.R. (1995, July 19). Memorandum from the Committee on Accountability and Effectiveness. Fort Pierce, FL: Indian River Community College.

Mintzberg, H. (1987, July-August). Crafting strategy. Harvard Business Review. 66-75.

Mintzberg, H. (1994). The rise and fall of strategic planning. New York: The Free Press.

Myran, G. & Howdyshell, L. Strategic management of community colleges in a dynamic environment. In G.A. Baker, J.D. Dudziak, & P. Tyler (Eds.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission and management (pp. 589-602). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Nichols, J.O. (1995). A practitioner's handbook for institutional effectiveness and student outcomes assessment implementation. (3rd ed.). New York: Agathon Press.

Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA). (1998). Review of the community college system's performance-based program budgeting measures and incentive fund (OPPAGA Report no. 97-49). Tallahassee, FL: Author.

Office of Program Policy Analysis (OPPAGA). (1998). Program evaluation and justification review of Florida's community college system (OPPAGA Report #98-06A). Tallahassee, FL: Author.

Palmer, J.C. (1994). Educational planning and assessment. In Cohen, A.M. & Brawer, F.B. (Eds.), Managing Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Parnell, D. (1990). Dateline 2000 the new higher education agenda. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Peters, T.J. (1982). In Search of Excellence. New York: Warner Books.

Peterson, M.W., Dill, D.D., & Mets, L.A. (1997). Planning and management for a changing environment, A handbook on redesigning posesecondary institutions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peterson, M.W. (ed.) ASHE reader on organization and governance in higher education (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Peterson, M.W. (1999, Winter). The role of institutional research: From improvement to redesign. In M.W. Peterson, (Ed.) New directions for institutional research,104. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Phelan, D.J. , Kirkland, T.P., & Freed, J.E. (1994, Fall). Strategic planning tactics for shared governance. Community Services CATALYST, 23 (4).

Pitts, R.A. & Lei, D. (1996). Strategic management: Building and sustaining competitive advantage. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

Roueche, J.E., Johnson, L.F. & Roueche, S.D. (1997). Embracing the tiger: The effectiveness debate & the community college. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.

Rourke, F.E. & Brooks, G.E. (1966). The managerial revolution in higher education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Rowley, D.J., Lujan, H.D., & Dolence, M.G. (1997). Strategic change in colleges and univerisities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rupert, S.S. (Ed.). (1994). Charting higher education accountability. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Senge, P.M. (1990). The fifth discipline. New York: Currency-Doubleday.

State Board of Community Colleges. (1999, January). A strategic plan for the millennium 1998-2003. Tallahassee, FL: Division of Community Colleges.

State Board of Community Colleges; establishment. Title XVI, Florida Statutes 240.305 (1999).

State of Florida Office of the Auditor General. (1993). Assessment of the state community college system accountability plan. (Report no. 12146). Tallahassee, FL: Author

Taylor, A.L. & Schmidtlein, F.A. (1996, April 25). Issues posed by graduate-research universities' changing environment and their planning responses. In Strategic planning's role in establishing university research policies and plans (project number: 9320680). Washington, DC: National Science Foundation Project.

The State Board of Community Colleges. Florida Department of Education. Available on line at http://www.dcc.firn.edu/sbccinfo/sbccinfo.htm

Tyree, L.W. & Hellmich, D.M. (1995, August/September). Florida's continuing accountability experiment: Yet another community college catch-22. Community college journal. 16-20.

Urbanowski, R. (1999). Emergent planning in higher education: The foundation of a new model. Educational Planning, 11 (4), 53-58.

Van de Water, G.B. (1994). Florida. In S.S. Ruppert (Ed.), Charting higher education accountability. (pp.27-39). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Zaleznik, A. (1998). Managers and leaders: Are they different? In Harvard Business Review on leadership. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.